

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. In the Office action, claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In the accompanying Amendment, claims 4, 7, and 13 have been cancelled. Claims 15-20 have been added. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-12, and 14 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims, as amended.

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112 – Claims 1-14

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-2, 5, and 8-14 are rejected insofar as these claims recite a three-dimensional feature portion. In response to the Examiner's rejections, claim 13 has been cancelled and claims 1-2, 5, 8-12, and 14 have been amended to recite a three-dimensional marker. The three-dimensional marker is recited as being located in an indicator region formed on the laser beam-emitting facet.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 1 for not defining a complete semiconductor laser structure and for not clearly reciting the location of a region different from the light-emitting region. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, recites a complete semiconductor laser structure. Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite an indicator region that is spaced at a distance from the light-emitting region.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 4 are rejected for being unclear as to the words "at part of the portion" that are recited in the claims. In response to the Examiner's rejection, claim 4 has been cancelled. Claim 3 has been amended to clarify

that the light shielding film is formed with a small opening in part of the portion of the light shielding film covering the light-emitting region. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 of claims 1-2, 5, and 8-14 are overcome by these claim amendments.

2. New Claims 15-20

New claim 15 depends from independent claim 14. As claim 14 is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons expressed above, so is claim 15 as it depends from claim 14. New independent claim 16 recites a semiconductor laser assembly with similar limitations to independent claim 1. As claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons expressed above, so is claim 16. New dependent claims 17-20 depend from independent claim 16. As claim 16 is believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons expressed above, so are claims 17-20 as they depend from claim 16.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes it to be clear that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of Applicant's claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-12, and 14-20 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-

Atty. Docket No.: 10416/15  
Serial No.: 10/039,490

8301. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 5:30 PM Pacific time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 05/28/03



Pamela G. Maher  
Registration No. 40,712  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN  
FELDER& STEINER LLP  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 711  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
(310) 712-8301